STRATEGY RESEARCH PROJECT

THE UNITED NATIONS PEACEKEEPING OPERATIONS DURING POSE-COLD WAR ERA -- AN ASSESSMENT

BY

BRIGADIER SYEED AHMED
Bangladesh

19960620 101

USAWC CLASS OF 1996

U.S. ARMY WAR COLLEGE, CARLISLE BARRACKS, PA 17013-5050

DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED 1

USAWC STRATEGY RESEARCH PROJECT

The views expressed in this paper are those of
the author and do not necessarily reflect the
views of the Department of Defense or any of
its agencies. This document may not be
released for open publication until it has
been cleared by the appropriate military
service or government agency.

THE UNITED NATIONS PEACEKEEPING OPERATIONS
DURING POST-COLD WAR ERA -- AN ASSESSMENT

by

Brigadier Syeed Ahmed
Bangladesh

Colonel Terry J. Young
Project Adviser

U.S. Army War College
Carlisle Barracks, Pennsylvania   17013

ABSTRACT

AUTHOR: Syeed Ahmed .(Brigadier), Bangladesh

TITLE: The United Nations Peacekeeping Operations
           During Post-Cold War Era -- An Assessment

FORMAT: Strategy Research Project

DATE: 28 May 1996   PAGES: 30   CLASSIFICATION: Unclassified

    It is increasingly recognized that the end of the Cold War
has led to a proliferation of regional and ethnic conflicts all
over the world. Notwithstanding various shortcomings, the United
Nations peacekeeping missions have played a vital role in
bringing many deadly conflicts to an end. It is evident that the
United Nations will continue to be called upon to play a major
role in the resolution of these intra-state conflicts. The main
purpose of this paper is to assess the performance of the United
Nations peacekeeping operations since the end of the Cold War.

THE UNITED NATIONS PEACEKEEPING OPERATIONS
DURING POST-COLD WAR ERA -- AN ASSESSMENT

INTRODUCTION

The promotion of international peace and security is symbolized in the opening words of the United Nations Charter. The founders of the United Nations (U.N.) had dedicated this organization to saving "succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which . . . has brought untold sorrow to mankind."[1] Aimed at achieving the principal goal of global peace and security, the U.N. attempts to: prevent international conflict, limit the spread and severity of conflict, and restore peace when conflict and violence occur. The U.N. attempts to accomplish its professed goal of promoting international peace and security by employing a number of approaches or procedures. They are:

First, by creating international "norms" against violence, conflict, and aggression; second, by providing a "debate alternative" to fighting; third, by providing "diplomatic intervention" aimed at assisting and encouraging countries to settle their disputes peacefully; fourth, by instituting diplomatic and economic "sanctions" against the agreed upon violators of peace and security; and fifth, by dispatching U.N. military forces to repel aggression or to act as a buffer between warring countries or groups. In the U.N., the fifth procedure of "collective military action" is known as "peacekeeping". Although the U.N. "peacekeeping" action is often authorized by General Assembly, "peacekeeping" operations are usually conducted under the auspices of the Security Council.

The procedures and approaches that have been listed in the foregoing paragraphs are employed by the U.N. for maintaining and enhancing peace and security throughout the world. Doubtless, each of the approaches is an important instrument for peacemaking and peacekeeping. However, this paper addresses only the issues and perspectives related to the "peacekeeping" approach of the U.N.

There are three types of missions that the U.N. undertakes for accomplishing its goal of maintaining international peace and security: the observer missions, peacekeeping missions, and peace-enforcement missions. "Neither peacekeeping nor peace observation is mentioned in the U.N. Charter, and there are no official or agreed definitions of these terms.[2] Rather, the "three basic elements of the charter system for maintaining international peace and security -- peaceful settlement, enforcement action, and arms regulation -- are closely interrelated. The evolution of peacekeeping has been in many respects a response to the failure to develop the second (enforcement action) of these elements as originally planned."[3]

However, after fifty years of U.N. peacekeeping experiences, it is quite possible to define both "peace observation" and "peacekeeping". The "peace observation missions" may be defined as those international forces that are present to observe a ceasefire that has been organized by two opposing sides of a dispute. On the otherhand, "peacekeeping missions" not only observe the ceasefire but also act as a buffer between two sides

2

of a conflict. While observation forces are usually unarmed, the peacekeeping forces are armed. In fact, "peace-enforcement missions" are different from both "observer missions" and "peacekeeping missions". "Peace-enforcement missions" observe, act as a buffer, and, as a last resort, are authorized to employ military forces to keep or restore peace. In other words, unlike "peace observers" and "peacekeepers", "peace-enforcers" are authorized to take part in the conflict. The U.N. authorized military interventions in Korea and the Persian Gulf are glaring examples of the U.N. "peace-enforcement" operations.[4]

According to William J. Durch, the term "peacekeeping" should stand for both peace observer mission and peacekeeping missions. In other words, Durch excludes the concept of "peace-enforcement missions" from the term "peacekeeping".[5] Given the fact that peacekeeping is different from peace-enforcement, for the purpose of the present paper the term peacekeeping will be used as reference to "observation" and "peacekeeping" missions of the U.N. For our present purpose, the intent of peacekeeping is conceived to be conflict management or settlement, and it does not necessarily get involved in assigning guilt or identifying an aggressor. The professed goal of a peacekeeping mission is to halt fighting already started, separate the waring parties, and create conditions for them to negotiate. Thus the broader definition of "peacekeeping" includes both observation and peacekeeping missions aimed at maintaining global peace. The U.N. peacekeeping forces serve as armed sentries. Popularly

known as the "Blue Berets" and "Blue Helmets" because the U.N. troops retain their national uniforms but wear U.N. headgear.

The main purpose of this paper is to assess the performance of the U.N. peacekeeping operations since the end of the Cold War. Following an overview of the U.N. peacekeeping during the Cold War era, this paper highlights the U.N. peacekeeping efforts during the post-Cold War era with an attempt to assess the performance of peacekeeping operations that were initiated during late 1980s and early 1990s. Finally, some conclusions will be attempted.

THE U.N. PEACEKEEPING OPERATIONS: THE COLD WAR ERA

During the Cold War era, the U.N. had serious limitations in the effective management of various international conflict due to the existence of superpower rivalry. In fact, the U.N. had failed to prevent the start and continuation of the Cold War. Doubtless, a review of the U.N.'s accomplishments concerning a central role in resolving conflicts or in creating durable peace may be discouraging.[6]

Although the U.N. has not always succeeded in dealing with a number of peace and security issues during the Cold War era, it needs to be clearly emphasized that the U.N. accomplishments in many instances are impressive. The U.N. continued to have major interest in enhancing world peace and security through various approaches. In fact, the U.N. was more successful in many peacekeeping efforts with medium or minor powers in situations where the superpowers were not strongly involved with opposite

4

sides.[7]

The U.N. peacekeeping operations originated in 1948 when the U.N. Security Council sent "U.N. observer missions" to "monitor" a truce between Israel and the surrounding Arab states.[8] This observation mission was entitled as United Nations Truce Supervision Organization in Palestine (UNTSO, 1948). Another early peacekeeping effort included the United Nations Military Observer Group in India and Pakistan (UNMOGIP, 1948). Beginning with the Suez crisis in 1956, the U.N. dispatched lightly armed peacekeeping forces, known as the U.N. Emergency Force (UNEF) to prevent Israeli and Egyptian hostilities. Most of these early peacekeeping operations are either still in existence or replenished with new operations. For example, both UNTSO and UNMOGIP are still pursuing original missions of peacekeeping. UNEF was subsequently replaced with United Nations Emergency Force II (UNEF II) in 1973, aimed at keeping peace and order in Sinai and Gaza Strip.[9]

There are other instances of U.N.'s professed commitment to world peace through various peacekeeping instruments or approaches. The U.N. Security Council has commissioned a number of peacekeeping operations for supervising or monitoring disengagements of waring factions or combatants. For example, U.N. military observers in Greece (UNMOG, 1952-1954) for investigating incidents along borders with Albania, former Yugoslavia and Bulgaria; U.N. force in Cyprus (UNFICYP, 1964 till present) to maintain law and order and peace between Greek and

Turkish communities; U.N. observer group in Lebanon (UNOGIL, June-December, 1958) to police border between Lebanon and Syria; U.N. Disengagement Observer Force (UNDOF, 1974 to present) to maintain ceasefire between Syria and Israel; U.N. Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFL, 1978 to present) to police Lebanon-Israeli border; U.N. Security Force (UNSF, 1962-1963) to facilitate transfer of West Irian to Indonesia; U.N. India-Pakistan Observation Mission (UNIPOM, 1965-1966) to supervise ceasefire and return of forces to original international boundary between India and Pakistan after 1965 War; and U.N. Operation in Belgiun Congo (now Zaire) (ONUC, 1960-1964) to keep peace and order, and preserve unity.[10]

The U.N. peacekeeping activities listed in the preceding paragraphs clearly show that "peacekeeping operations" are not new to the post-Cold War era. Rather, it is fair to suggest that U.N. had continued various types of peacekeeping operations during the entire period of Cold War era.[11] All of the U.N. peacekeeping operations were multinational in composition. None of the peacekeeping operations included troops from either the U.S.A. or U.S.S.R. The exclusion of superpower troops in the U.N. operation was aimed at avoiding or preventing an East-West confrontation in global politics.[12]

THE SECOND GENERATION U.N. PEACEKEEPING OPERATIONS: THE POST-COLD WAR ERA

Although the U.N. peacekeeping operations during the post-Cold War era are also composed of multinational forces, there is a glaring difference between during and after the Cold War

6

periods. After the Cold War, the U.N. peacekeeping operations include forces from both the U.S.A. and Russia. Another distinctive feature of peacekeeping operations of Cold War era is that almost all of the conflicts were interstate rivalries between or among sovereign nation-states. It will be evident from the following paragraphs that, in recent years most of the peacekeeping operations were concerned with intergroup rivalries within states.

It is thus far evident that U.N. peacekeeping operations were neither conceived nor organized after the end of the Cold War. The peacekeeping operations have stood the test of time since the founding of the U.N. in 1945 even though the Cold War divided the wartime allies. However, the end of the Cold War added momentum to U.N. initiated peacekeeping operations. These peacekeeping operations have also been viewed to be gaining greater coherence since late 1980s and early 1990s. Although U.N. peacekeeping has gained limelight in recent years, it needs to be recognized that the U.N. system has been operating in a new international environment since the Cold War ended. By 1991, continued economic stagnation and socio-political upheaval resulted in the collapse of Communist regimes in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. The Cold War came to an end with the fall of the Berlin Wall and the reunification of Germany and the disintegration of the U.S.S.R. The world context went through massive changes within a very short period of time. Gene M. Lyon has succinctly summarized the new international environment in

the following words:

> The Cold War has ended; some decolonized states have
> been integrated into the increasingly interdependent
> world economy while others continue to struggle against
> poverty and social and political instability, . . . a
> new wave of independent states has emerged out of the
> collapse of the Soviet Union and its hold over Eastern
> Europe, . . . transnational economic forces and social
> movements now challenge the pre-eminent role of states
> for influence in the international system; conflict
> that threaten international peace are often between
> factions within states rather than between states; and
> the role of (U.N.) military forces has become less
> central in many disputes where economic or moral issues
> are at stake.[13]

The assessment of the performance of U.N. peacekeeping
operations must be made with specific reference to the volatile
international environment. Of all the factors cited in the
preceding quote, inter-group (intrastate conflict instead of
interstate conflict) rivalries and conflicts have intensified in
the post-Cold War period. Many of the intergroup tensions in
recent years have resulted in many "deadly conflicts" that led to
prolonged mass violence, expulsion, and slaughter on massive
scale.[14] The U.N. has been increasingly engaged in recent years
to address the looming threats to World Peace posed by intergroup
violence. The U.N. sponsored peacekeeping operations in
Nicaragua (ONUCA, 1989), El Salvador (ONUSAL, 1992), Somalia
(UNOSOM, 1992), Angola (UNAVEM, 1988), Namibia (UNTAG, 1989-
1990), Western Sahara (MINURSO, 1992), Bosnia-Herzegovina
(UNPROFOR, 1992), and Cambodia (UNTAC, 1992) have one common
denominator. Each of these conflicts was chiefly motivated by
internal intergroup rivalries that led to outbreaks of mass
violence and deadly conflicts.

8

PROFILE OF RECENT U.N. PEACEKEEPING OPERATIONS

ONUCA. The U.N. Observer Group in Central America was installed in 1989 and is still involved in the region. The professed aim of ONUCA is to ensure that no country in the region aid rebels in another country. It also assisted in the disarming and demobilization of the Contra rebels in Nicaragua.[15]

ONUSAL. The U.N. Observer Mission in El Salvador actually began operation in 1991 with about 1,000 U.N. troops. Their initial intent was to monitor the ceasefire between the government and leftist guerrillas and to protect human rights.

The U.N. peacekeeping in El Salvador is cited as one of the U.N.'s successful operations.[16] In January 1992, when the peace agreement was signed by the government and leftist guerrillas (FMLN), the mandate of ONUSAL was extended toward peace building and peacekeeping in war-torn El Salvador. Specifically, through the U.N. Security Council Resolution 729, ONUSAL's role included "the supervision of that section of the agreement concerned with the cessation of armed conflict and the dissolution of the national police and its replacement by a new civilian force."[17] ONUSAL operations included military observers, police officials, human rights experts and a wide range of experts in other civilian problems such as land reform, constitutional reform, and the organization of electoral procedures.

"It may be said that," according to Olga Pellicer, "today's military and political institutions in El Salvador would be inconceivable without U.N. participation."[18] Although the peace

process in El Salvador is yet to be fully realized, the U.N. peacekeeping operations may be credited to have achieved substantial gains in terms of human rights and, in general, in the reconstruction of civil and political institutions within a short period of time.[19]

UNIIMOG. The U.N. Iran-Iraq Military Observer Group (1988) was created to supervise ceasefire along the borders between Iran and Iraq.

UNTAG. The U.N. Transition Assistance Group (1989-1990) was dispatched to keep various rebels and South African troops apart and supervise free and fair elections as part of Namibia's transition from colony of South Africa to complete independence on March 21, 1990. This peacekeeping operation is also cited as one of the useful and successful U.N. peacekeeping missions.[20]

UNAVEM. The United Nations Angola Verification Mission (1988 till present time) was authorized to monitor the complete withdrawal of Cuban and South African troops from Angola by 1991. UNAVEM also monitored 1992 elections. This is also characterized as a successful U.N. peacekeeping mission.[21]

MINURSO. The U.N. Mission for the Referendum in Western Africa (1992) is an ongoing U.N. peacekeeping operation. MINURSO is authorized to deploy up to 2,700 unarmed or lightly armed observers to monitor the attempt to have a referendum by which the people of the Western Sahara would decide on independence or continued association with Morocco.[22]

UNTAC. U.N. Transitional Authority in Cambodia (1992) was

assigned the task of helping the Cambodians to establish a legitimate government through free and fair elections. This was an ambitious U.N. peacekeeping mission. During the year 1991-1992, this peacekeeping operation involved more than 22,000 U.N. troops costing 2.6 billion dollars. Although it was a very expensive endeavor, UNTAC achieved success in a number of ways. UNTAC succeeded to register 4.64 million voters (96% of eligible voters) and supervise elections for a newly formed Constituent Assembly.[23]

Although UNTAC has not been able to fully dismantle and disarm major guerilla forces, especially the Khemer Rouge, the accomplishments of the U.N. peacekeeping forces are noteworthy in a deadly conflict ridden situation like Cambodia. The accomplishment of UNTAC are also encouraging if one compares the existence of violent conflicts prior to the arrival of UNTAC forces in Cambodia.

UNOSOM. The U.N. Operation in Somalia (1992) was created to bring about a ceasefire and to protect relief workers and supplies being distributed to refugees from the intergroup conflicts. The first U.N. peacekeeping troops, a 500-soldier Pakistani contingent, started arriving in September 1992. By December 1992, more than 30,000 U.N. troops, mostly U.S. troops, joined the peace efforts.[24]

This mission was initially hailed as one of the largest U.N. humanitarian missions aimed at alleviating mass starvation and widespread suffering. But by mid-1993 the UNOSOM troops were

drawn into a very volatile internal political turmoil.
Occasional fighting and casualties began affecting Somalian
warlords and U.N. forces. The most dramatic turn took place when
the U.N. forces, under the leadership of the U.S. troops, tried
to capture the Somalian warlord Farah Aidid. In view of the
unexpected casualties of American troops, it was decided that the
withdrawal of U.S. troops was a better option. In fact, the
United States completed the withdrawal of its troops from Somalia
by the end of March 1994. The remaining U.N. peacekeeping
mission "was left understrength and overcommitted".[25] The mission
was finally closed in 1995.

UNPROFOR. The U.N. Protection Force (1992) started in early
1992 and had involved more than 10,000 U.N. troops in Croatia and
Bosnia-Herzegovina. UNPROFOR operations tried to achieve a
ceasefire and deliver relief supplies. A small U.N. force was
also dispatched to Macedonia in December 1992 and early 1993 to
prevent the spread of deadly conflicts to that country.[26]

Although ethnic tensions in Yugoslavia between Serbs,
Croats, and the Bosnian Muslims increased after the fall of
Communist state, serious fighting broke out in the summer of
1990.[27] Before the U.N. got involved in the conflict, the
European community sought to bring the waring parties to a
political settlement. "By September 1991, both West and East
European governments began to urge U.N. action on the grounds
that a threat to the peace was manifest."[28] The idea of the U.N.
Protection Force (UNPORFOR) was approved by the U.N. Security

12

Council after serious deliberations, and the U.N. force was being deployed in early 1992. Although the UNPROFOR "has for the most part been successful in distributing and ensuring access to humanitarian relief supplies, it has been unable to find a solution to the root problem of ethnic hatred in that region."[29]

THE U.N. PEACEKEEPING OPERATIONS DURING POST-COLD WAR ERA: AN ASSESSMENT

Although the U.N. had limited successes in peacekeeping operations during the Cold War era, the U.N., in general, had performed what may be described as "curative" as well as "preventive" roles. In fact, the U.N. peacekeeping operations during the post-Cold War era have also been characterized by curative and preventive roles. While "peacekeeping" is an old responsibility of the U.N., its peacekeeping role remained largely unnoticed almost four decades. The demand on the U.N. to assume a greater role in peacekeeping tremendously increased during the late 1980s.

The U.N. had installed a peacekeeping force entitled "the U.N. Iran-Iraq Military Observer Group" (UNIIMOG) in 1988 to monitor the ceasefire between Iran and Iraq. It needs to be mentioned that shortly after UNIIMOG operation started, the U.N. peacekeeping forces were awarded the 1988 Nobel Prize for Peace. The Nobel Committee called the U.N. peacekeeping forces "a tangible expression of the World community's will to solve conflicts by peaceful means."[30] The prize was accepted by the then U.N. Secretary General, Perez de Cuellar. In his Nobel Prize acceptance speech, Perez de Cuellar pointed out that

13

despite regional conflicts in many parts of the world --
conflicts in which the U.S. A. and the Soviet Union, with their
huge nuclear arsenals, could have become involved -- the U.N. had
played a significant role in preventing such deadly conflicts.
He also pointed out that "the community of nations . . . (is) now
encountering a new generation of global problems which can only
be faced effectively through an unprecedented degree of
international cooperation." The Secretary General also
emphasized the relevance of U.N. peacekeeping efforts in
resolving various international conflicts when he suggested "the
use of soldiers as a catalysts for peace rather than as the
instruments of war."[31]

There is no doubt that the 1988 Nobel Prize for Peace added
momentum to U.N. peacekeeping endeavors. The U.N. peacekeeping
during the post-Cold War period had its formal start in November
1989 when, at the joint initiative of the former Soviet Union and
the U.S.A., the U.N. General Assembly adopted a consensus
resolution (Resolution #44/21) entitled "Enhancing International
Peace, Security, and International Cooperation in All its Aspects
in Accordance with the Charter of the United Nations." This
resolution is credited to be the beginning of the end of the
confrontation between East and West.[32]

The U.N.'s original or traditional peacekeeping roles have
expanded since 1989. However, the first dramatic expansion of
the U.N. peacekeeping role occurred after the first U.N. Security
Council Summit held in New York City in January 1992. The

14

leaders in this summit explicitly recognized the immediate need for expanding the peacekeeping role of the U.N. The summmit resolution called on the Secretary General, Boutros Boutros-Ghali to report to the Security Council by July 1, 1992, on the ways and means to strengthen the U.N.'s capacity for "preventive diplomacy, for peacemaking, and for peacekeeping." Aimed at achieving a "peacemaking" goal, the summit leaders obviously emphasized, at least by implication, the more aggressive stand by the U.N. The summit resolution indicated that the Secretary General may seek to implement Article 43 of the U.N. Charter, which specifies that mechanism for establishing a permanent U.N. Force for peacekeeping operations.[33]

The report entitled "An Agenda for Peace: Preventive Diplomacy, Peacemaking and Peacekeeping," prepared by the Secretary General Boutros-Ghali, to a great extent, captured the promise of the U.N. in a fast changing and volatile international environment. This report had been characterized as an optimistic and a courageous initiative toward achieving world peace. Boutros Boutros-Ghali's "Agenda for Peace" was innovative enough to embrace a proactive role instead of the traditional reactive role in the U.N. peacekeeping operations. He called for the creation of heavily armed "peace enforcement units" aimed at restoring and maintaining ceasefire agreements that have disintegrated. The Secretary General had also indicated that the U.N. peacekeeping forces should be deployed even before trouble started.[34] The January 1992 Security Council Summit and the

subsequent "Agenda for Peace" of Secretary General clearly showed how assertive and proactive the U.N.'s role could be in ensuring and enhancing international peace and security during the post-Cold War environment.

It is evident that the expanded role of the U.N. in the late 1980s and early 1990s included disarming insurgents (Nicaragua), monitoring elections (Namibia, Nicaragua, and Haiti), monitoring ceasefire and creation of new joint army (Angola), monitoring buffer zone after Gulf War (Iraq-Kuwait border), conducting referendum (Western Sahara), monitoring human rights, elections and government restructuring (El Salvador), providing security for humanitarian shipments to victims of civil war (Somalia), supervising government functions and eventual elections while rebuilding the country and disarming the warring factions (Cambodia), preventing the spread of deadly conflicts in adjacent nation (Macedonia), and trying to achieve a ceasefire and facilitate the delivery of relief supplies (Croatia and Bosnia-Herzegovina). Although all of these peacekeeping operations did not achieve all of the professed objectives, the sheer number and magnitude of those U.N. operations were commendable accomplishments. For example, from 1988-89 through 1992-93, more than 10 peacekeeping operations were committed by the U.N., whereas in the previous 44 years, such U.N. peacekeeping missions did not exceed 13.[35]

It is pertinent to point out that with the exceptions of UNIIMOG (aimed at monitoring ceasefire between Iran and Iraq) and

UNIKOM (aimed at monitoring buffer zones after the Gulf War), all other peacekeeping operations were involved in internal conflicts of various nations.

As already noted, many of the intergroup rivalries have thus far resulted in many deadly conflicts. And the assessment of the performance of peacekeeping operations should take into account the volatile nature of domestic conflicts in which the U.N. got involved over the post-Cold War years. Indeed, the U.N. peacekeeping experience during the post-Cold War era has been a departure from traditional peacekeeping role. Therefore, expectations from recent peacekeeping operations also went through qualitative change. As William J. Doll and Steven Metz succinctly summarized the context in the following words:

> As the United Nations successfully intervened in a spate of festering Third World conflicts, peacekeeping became a true growth industry. For every U.N. peacekeeping force deployed, there were two, three, or four other nations clamoring for multinational involvement. This change was also qualitative as traditional peacekeeping evolved into second generation peace operations.[36]

There is no denying the fact that the proactive stance of second generation peacekeeping operation was embraced by a host of world leaders. President Francois Mitterand of France enthusiastically offered 1,000 French soldiers who could be mobilized within 48 hours of a U.N. call. The French willingness and capability was demonstrated during the Rwanda crisis in April 1995. Speaking to the U.N. in September 1992, U.S. President Bush positively responded to the deadly conflicts in Bosnia and to the Boutros Boutros-Ghali's Agenda for Peace by clearly

indicating "a willingness to begin to train U.S. units to coordinate with the units from other countries so that they could rapidly join in a U.N. force." "The (U.S.) President also promised to turn over Fort Dix in New Jersey to the U.N. for training purposes".[37] Although many members of the U.S. Congress were opposed to the idea of any large "foreign aid" expense, President Bush requested Congress for approving $810 million in peacekeeping funds. However, some members of Congress did not miss the opportunity to be enthusiastic supporters of expansive role of U.N. in peacekeeping. For example, Senator David Boren, the then Chairman of U.S. Senate Intelligence Committee expressed that "it is time to create a genuine multilateral mechanism that can deal with "various international crises". He also pointed out that history "will hold us accountable if we do not".[38]

The rising expectations of U.N. peacekeeping efforts were widespread among world leaders. William J. Doll and Steven Metz depicted the supportive mood when they wrote:

> This expansion and evolution of peacekeeping initially spawned great expectations. Optimists, both within and outside governments, considered multinational peace operations a panacea for Third World conflict, a model for mature cooperative security, and fruition of dreams spun by U.N. founders.[39]

The widespread support for U.N. peacekeeping operations drastically waned immediately after apparent failures in Somalia and Bosnia missions. "Suddenly, the world community questioned the effectiveness of multinational peace operations and the Clinton administration -- initially an ardent advocate of a more active UN -- took a second critical look".[40] "While calls for

18

U.N. involvement persisted among the conflict-ridden nations of the Third World, support from the rest of the world faded and 1993 became, according to Madeleine K. Albright (U.S. Ambassador to U.N.), the U.N.'s Summer of Discontent."[41]

Despite several setbacks in Bosnia and Somalia, U.N.'s peacekeeping goals were achieved in most of the second generation peacekeeping operations. Unfortunately, the critics were too quick to magnify the pitfalls of UNPROFOR and UNOSOM without any regard to the commendable accomplishments of other peacekeeping operations. A thorough review of other peacekeeping operations of late 1980s and early 1990s will reveal that the critics either deflated or ignored strides made in successful operations such as ONUCA (Nicaragua), ONUSAL (El Salvador), and UNTAC (Cambodia). The critics of U.N. multinational peacekeeping mission ignored the fact that by 1993 "peacekeeping" had become institutionalized as a U.N. response to conflicts that have the potential to spread, even though many operations tremendously increased financial crises for the world organization. Those critics also ignored the fact that the concept of peacekeeping was rather a tentative and piecemeal approach to peacekeeping and peacemaking compared with more grander style of collective security.

It is to be noted that the U.N. peacekeeping forces were prominently visible in late 1980s and early 1990s to a virtually unprecedented degree. The U.N. got involved in many conflicts within the shortest possible timeframe. Doubtless, the U.N. made strides in several areas of global cooperation which contributed

towards the maintenance of peace. Yet the so-called failure in Somalia and Bosnia caused disillusionment among crucially important partners of the U.N. peacekeeping operations. While attention may be given to the sources of such disillusionment, concerted efforts should be initiated to investigate the nature of conflicts in which peacekeeping forces did not excel. The rules of engagement both in Bosnia and Somalia operations may be thoroughly reexamined before these missions are characterized as "failed" missions. Although missions of UNOSOM (Somalia) have not been fully accomplished, its humanitarian spirit aimed at protecting supplies and relief workers can be characterized as viable achievements. Similarly, UNPROFOR (Bosnia) can be credited for paving the way for having reached a treaty between warring factions in Balkans and subsequent direct involvement of NATO troops.

Given the problematic nature of UNPROFOR accomplishments, it is fair to suggest that the U.N. was just one of the principal international peacekeeping actors involved in the volatile and complex conflicts in the territories of former Yugoslavia. The European Community (EC) was the first international actor involved in peacekeeping operations in these conflicts (as early as June 1991 when Slovenia and Croatia declared independence). Although NATO had some backup roles, the EC had been involved in efforts to stop armed clashes among various parties even before the creation of UNPROFOR. It needs to be pointed out that the involvement of EC was evident before, during, and after the

20

involvement of the U.N. Therefore, UNPROFOR activities cannot be meaningfully separated from EC and NATO activities. It is observed that many of the problems faced by the peacekeepers "were in large part a function of the EC's inexperience and incompetence in negotiating ceasefires... After the U.N. became involved in ceasefire negotiations in November 1991, the situation began to improve.[42]

The U.N. peacekeeping mission in former Yugoslavia was characterized as "successful' during the initial months because UNPROFOR could stabilize the "cessation of open hostilities -- although there were, on average, ten violations a day in the first year of operation."[43] However, it is also pointed out that UNPROFOR had failed to secure implementation of two other "aspects of the ceasefire agreement negotiated by the U.N.'s special envoy Cyrus Vance: demilitarization of the UNPAs (U.N. Protected Areas) and the return of population to them.[44] Obviously, these "failures" continued to remain sources of more conflicts. But these failures cannot be attributed only to UNPROFOR without examining the involvement of EC. One needs to note that the U.N. Secretary General showed serious reservations when the West European countries were insisting for more direct military actions. For example, "by late spring 1992, Boutros Boutros-Ghali was saying publicly that the U.N. approach had not been a success.[45] In all fairness, failures of UNPROFOR in Yugoslavia crises can be attributed to various factors. While the U.N. was part of the problem, the chief factor is the

reluctance to use force by other international actors. As James Gow notes:

> In Bosnia, bridges were burned, in Western capitals, they were not. Those capitals, either alone, or jointly, were not prepared to mount a full scale armed intervention, despite frequent calls for strong action to stop the shocking brutality and suffering in Bosnia, and to save either people or bridges. Whatever measures were taken, and with whatever conviction, they largely excluded the possibility of a major military intervention -- although the matter was intensely considered at certain points. While there was a major international effort to deal with the problems of the break up of the former Yugoslavia federation involving strong commitments from a large number of countries around the world, the misery of Bosnia grew over eighteen months as various international actors failed to take a grip on the situation there.[46]

CONCLUSION

Notwithstanding various problems and inadequacies, the U.N. peacekeeping missions have played a vital role in bringing many deadly conflicts to an end, especially in Africa, Central America, Southeast Asia, and Middle East. It is increasingly recognized that the end of the Cold War had either led or promted a proliferation of regional and ethnic conflicts all over the world. It is thus far evident that the U.N. will continue to be called upon to play a major role in the resolution of these intra-state conflicts.

Doubtless, the U.N. involvement in Somalia and former Yugoslavia showed the inherent difficulties and dangers of intervening in deadly conflicts of the nations. Yet the difficulties in Bosnia-Herzegovina operation also showed the need for readiness and explicit commitment of the international actors involved in peacekeeping endeavors. But the U.N. peacekeeping

22

operations in Cambodia and El Salvador clearly show the U.N. peacekeeping forces can and actually do settle conflicts and help build new governments. However, it is yet to be seen whether or not the world leaders are willing to see the U.N. peacekeeping forces settle conflicts, build new governments, or just "separate the combatants".

ENDNOTES

1.   Osmaczyk, Edmund, ed., <u>Encyclopedia of the United Nations and International Agreements</u>, 2d ed. (New York: Taylor and Francis, 1990), 946.

2.   Wainhouse, David W, <u>International Peacekeeping at the Crossroads: National Support Experience and Prospects</u> (Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1973), 1.

3.   Ibid., 5.

4.   Spiegel, Steven, <u>World Politics in a New Era</u>, (Texas: Harcourt Brace, 1995), 425.

5.   Durch, William J., ed., <u>The Evolution of U.N. Peacekeeping</u>, (New York: St. Martin's Press), 1.

6.   Farnsworth, David, <u>International Relations: An Introduction</u>, (Dulucue, Iowa: Brown and Benchmark, 1992), 307.

7.   Russet, Bruce and Harvey Starr, <u>World Politics: The Menu for Choice</u> (New York: W.H. Freeman and Company, 1992), 478.

8.   Altschiller, Donald, ed., <u>The United Nations' Role in World Affairs</u> (New York: The H. W. Wilson Company, 1993).

9.   Wainhouse, 198-266.

10.   Wainhouse; Farnsworth, 307-308; Rourke, John T., <u>International Politics on the World Stage</u> (The Dushkin Publishing Group, Inc.), 342-343.

11.   Durch, 1-2.

12.   Farnsworth, 307.

13.   Lyons, Gene M., Introduction to the Special Issue, "Organizing International Relations: Fifty Years After the United Nations Charter," <u>International Social Science Review</u> no. 144 (June 1995): 191.

14.   Carnegie Commission. <u>Carnegie Commission on Deadly Conflict: Progress Report</u> (New York: Carnegie Corporation, July 1995), 3.

15.   Rourke, 343.

16.   Pellicer, Olga, "Successes and Weaknesses of Recent United Nations Operations in the Field of International Security," <u>International Social Science Journal</u>, no. 144 (1995):

305-314.

17. Ibid., 309.

18. Ibid., 307.

19. Ibid., 306.

20. Rourke, 343; Durch, 10.

21. Rourke, 343.

22. Rourke, 343.

23. Spiegel, 423.

24. Rourke, 343; Durch, 10.

25. Spiegel, 426.

26. Rourke, 343; Baehr, Peter R. and Leon Gordenker, <u>The United Nations in the 1990s</u> (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1994), 85-87.

27. Baehr and Gordenker, 85.

28. Ibid., 85.

29. Spiegel, 926.

30. Altschiller, 22.

31. Ibid., 23.

32. Petrovsky, Vladimir, "Multifaceted Cooperation: A Post-Confrontational Perspective for the UN," <u>Disarmament</u> XIII, no. 2 (1990).

33. Rourke, 424.

34. Boutros-Ghali, Boutros, <u>An Agenda for Peace: Preventive Diplomacy, Peacemaking and Peacekeeping</u> (New York: UN, 1992).

35. Durch, 10; Rourke, 343.

36. Doll, William and Steven Metz, <u>The Army and Multinational Peace Operations: Problems and Solutions</u> (Carlisle Barracks, PA: Strategic Studies Institute and US Army Peacekeeping Institute, U.S. Army War College, 1993), 2.

37. Rourke, 424.

38. Ibid., 424.

39. Doll and Metz, 2-3.

40. Ibid., 3.

41. Ibid., 3.

42. Gow, James, "Nervous Bunnies: The International Community and the Yogoslav War of Dissolution, the Politics of Military Intervention in a Time of Change," in Frudman, Lawrence, ed., <u>Military Intervention in European Conflicts</u> (Oxford, U.K.: Blackwell Publishers, 1994), 17.

43. Ibid., 17.

44. Ibid., 17.

45. Baehr and Gordenker, 84.

46. Gow, 14.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Altschiller, Donald, ed. <u>The United Nations' Role in World Affairs</u>. New York: The H.W. Wilson Company, 1993.

Baehr, Peter R. and Leon Gordenker. <u>The United Nations: Reality and Ideal</u>. New York: Prager Publishers, 1984.

_____. <u>The United Nations in 1990s</u>. New York: St. Martins Press, 1994.

Boutros-Ghali, Boutros. <u>An Agenda for Peace: Preventive Diplomacy, Peacemaking and Peacekeeping</u>. Report of the Secretary-General pursuant to the statement adopted by the Summit Meeting of the Security Council on January 31, 1991. New York: United Nations, 1992.

_____. "Empowering the United Nations." <u>Foreign Affairs</u>, Vol. 71, No. 5 (Winter 1992/1993): 89-102.

_____. "An Agenda for Peace: One Year Later." <u>ORBIS</u>, Vol. 37, No. 3 (Summer 1993): 323-332.

Berkowitz, Bruce. "Rules of Engagement for UN Peacekeeping." <u>ORBIS</u> (Fall 1994).

Carnegie Corporation of New York. <u>Carnegie Commission on Preventing Deadly Conflict: Progress Report</u>. New York: Carnegie Corporation, July 1995.

Doll, William J., and Steven Metz. <u>The Army and Multinational Peace Operations: Problems and Solutions</u>. Carlisle Barracks, PA: Strategic Studies Institute and U.S. Army Peacekeeping Institute, U.S. Army War College, 1993.

Durch, William J., ed. <u>The Evolution of UN Peacekeeping</u>. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1992.

_____. <u>The United Nations and Collective Security in the 21st Century</u>. Carlisle Barracks, PA: U.S. Army War College, Strategic Studies Institute, 1993.

Elliot, Jeffrey. <u>Reader in International Relations</u>. Dubuque, Iowa: Brown & Benchmark, 1992.

Farnsworth, David. <u>International Relations: An Introduction</u>. Chicago: Nelson-Hall, 1988.

Freedman, Lawrence, ed. <u>Military Intervention in European Conflicts</u>. Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishers, 1994.

Forrester, Geoff. "Peacekeeping at Crossroads." <u>Peacekeeping:</u>
     <u>Challenge for Future</u>. Canberra: Australian Defense Studies,
     Centra, Australian Defense Force Academy, 1993.

Gow, James. "Nervous Bunnies: The International Community and
     the Yugoslav War of Dissolution, the Politics of Military
     Intervention in a Time of Change." In Freedman, Lawrence,
     ed. <u>Military Intervention in European Conflicts</u>. Oxford,
     UK: Blackwell Publishers, 1994.

Kay, David A., ed. <u>The Changing United Nations: Options for</u>
     <u>the United States</u>. New York: The Academy of Political
     Science, 1977.

Lee, John M., Robert Von Pagerhardt, and Timothy W. Stanley.
     <u>Strengthening United Nations Peacekeeping and Peacemaking: A</u>
     <u>Survey</u>. Washington, DC: International Economic Studies
     Institute, April 1992.

Lyons, Gene M. Introduction to the Special Issue, "Organizing
     International Relations: Fifty Years After the United
     Nations Charter." <u>International Social Science Journal</u>, No.
     144 (Jun 1995).

Osmaczyk, Edmund, ed., <u>Encyclopedia of the United Nations and</u>
     <u>International Agreements</u>, 2d ed. (New York: Taylor &
     Francis, 1990).

Pellicer, Olga. "Successes and Weaknesses of Recent United
     Nations Operations in the Field of International Security."
     <u>International Social Science Journal</u>, No. 144 (June 1995).

Petrovsky, Vladimir. "Multifaceted Cooperation: A
     Post-Confrontational Perspective for the United Nations."
     <u>Disarmament</u>, Vol. XIII, No. 2 (United Nations), 1990.

Rourke, John T. <u>International Politics on the World Stage</u>,
     4th ed. The Dushkin Publishing Group, Inc., 1993.

Roy, James Lee. <u>Global Politics</u>, 4th ed. Texas: Houghton
     Mifflin, 1990.

Russet, Bruce, and Harvey Star, <u>World Politics: The Menu for</u>
     <u>Choice</u>, 4th ed. New York: W. H. Freeman and Company, 1992.

Smith, Hugh, ed. <u>Peacekeeping: Challenges for Future</u>.
     Cenberra: Australian Defense Studies, Centra, Australian
     Defense Force Academy, 1993.

Spiegel, Steven. <u>World Politics in a New Era</u>. Texas: Harcourt
     Brace College Publishers, 1995.

Wainhouse, David W. International Peacekeeping at the
     Crossroads: National Support-Experience and Prospects.
     Baltimore, Maryland: The John Hopkins University Press,
     1973.